DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 044 EC 302 669

AUTHOR Chiodo, Carolyn B.
TITLE Increasing Academic Achievement of Second Grade Learning Disabled Students through Implementation of a Resource/Consultative Service Delivery Model.
PUB DATE 8 Jul 93
NOTE 84p.; Ed.D. Practicum Report, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Consultation Programs; *Curriculum Based Assessment; Delivery Systems; Elementary School Students; Grade 2; Inservice Teacher Education; *Learning Disabilities; Primary Education; Program Effectiveness; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Resource Teachers; *Teaching Models; Teamwork

ABSTRACT

This practicum implemented a resource/consultative model in place of a pullout model that was failing to meet the needs of second grade students with specific learning disabilities (SLD), at-risk students, and regular and special educators. The practicum involved conducting team meetings, increasing faculty awareness, and implementing curriculum-based assessment. Informal consultation services were provided and workshops were held to explain and provide instructional assistance in implementing the model. A team was developed to establish schedules for in-class remediation, direct service, and consultation. In-class remediation progressed from teacher-directed activities, through SLD teacher-directed activities, to shared planning on unit presentations. Students within the targeted classroom showed improvements in academic achievement, but objectives identifying specific academic outcomes were not entirely satisfied. However, teacher evaluation forms indicated positive acceptance of the model and faculty voted to incorporate the model into the school's improvement plan for the coming year. Appendices include the program evaluation form, the resource/consultation log, and the student progress form. Tables provide details of the academic achievement and curriculum mastery test results. (Contains 65 references.) (Author/DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 365 044

Increasing Academic Achievement of Second Grade Learning Disabled Students Through Implementation of a Resource/Consultative Service Delivery Model

by

Carolyn B. Chiodo

Cluster 40

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Carolyn B. Chiodo
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Practicum II Report Presented to the
Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1993

EC 302669

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier: _____

Mr. John Zoretich

PRINCIPAL

Title

5110 ASHTON ROAD, SARASOTA, FL 34233

Address

6-15-93

Date

This practicum report was submitted by Carolyn B. Chiodo under the direction of the advisor listed below. It was submitted to the Ed. D. Program in Child and Youth Studies and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

Approved:

7-8-93

Date of Final Approval of Report

Mary F. Staggs Ed.D.

Mary F. Staggs, Ed.D. Advisor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer would like to thank her practicum advisor, Dr. Mary Staggs, whose warmth, encouragement, and gentle guidance paved the way for completion of this practicum. Sincere appreciation is extended to this writer's administrator and school staff for believing in this project. Finally, love, heartfelt thankfulness, and gratitude to this writer's husband for his encouragement, understanding, and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Title Page i

Approval Page ii

Acknowledgements iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES v

ABSTRACT vi

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION 1

Description of Education Within Community 1
Description of Local School and Population 1
Writer's Work Setting and Role 2

II STUDY OF THE PROBLEM 4

Problem Description 4
Documentation of the Problem 5
Causative Analysis 7
Review of the Literature 9

III ANTICIPATED GOALS AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS 16

General Goal 16
Specific Objectives 16
Evaluation Instruments 17

IV SOLUTIONS 19

Solutions Suggested by Literature 19
Implementation Strategy 25
Report of Action Taken 26

V RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 40
Results 40
Discussion 53
Recommendations 62
Dissemination 63

REFERENCES 64

Appendices

A PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM 72
B RESOURCE/CONSULTATION LOG 74
C STUDENT PROGRESS FORM 77

LIST OF TABLES

Table
1. Curriculum Mastery Test Results 41
2. Curriculum Mastery Test Results: Rank Order 42
3. Written Language Assessment Comparisons 43
4. Individual Coding Skills Test Results 45
5. Cumulative Spelling Test Results 46
6. Teacher Evaluation Form 47
7. R/C Teacher Evaluation Form 49

ABSTRACT

Increasing Academic Achievement of Second Grade Learning Disabled Students Through Implementation of a Resource/Consultative Service Delivery Model. Chiodo, Carolyn B., 1993: Practicum II Report, Nova University, Ed. D. Program in Child and Youth Studies. Resource-Consultative Teaching/ Learning Disabilities/ Team Teaching/ Special Education/ Educational Cooperation

This practicum was designed to introduce a change in the educational service delivery system for second grade learning disabled students. Increasing numbers of learning disabled students and an expanding dichotomy between regular and special education provided the incentive for change. A Resource/ Consultative Model was implemented to replace the traditional pullout model that was failing to meet the needs of learning disabled students, regular educators, at-risk students, and special educators.

ESE team meetings, faculty awareness, choice of targeted classroom, and curriculum-based assessment were important factors in development and design. These components were enhanced through informal consultation services and workshops that were intended to explain, encourage understanding, and provide instructional assistance in implementing the R/C model.

Academic results provided support of the R/C model although they failed to indicate the anticipated success for consultative services for SLD students. Teacher evaluation forms which indicated positive acceptance of the model were validated when the faculty voted to incorporate the model into the school's improvement plan for the coming year.

****

Permission Statement

As a student in the Ed. D. Program in Child and Youth Studies, I do give permission to Nova University to distribute copies of this practicum report on request from interested individuals. It is my understanding that Nova University will not charge for this dissemination except to cover the costs of microfiching, handling, and mailing of materials.

5/15/93 _____ Carolyn B. Chiodo _____

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Education Within Community

Located in the southeastern United States, the coastal community in which this practicum was based, boasted a cultural richness that was reflected in its diversity and attractions. The largest employer within the community was the school system. This medium sized metropolitan area took pride in its innovative educational system which offered a range of educational opportunity. From pre-school to university level, there were 36 schools, including four senior high, five middle, and 19 elementary, plus alternative programs and exceptional student facilities. Private, parochial and special purpose schools completed the educational picture. The community was coping with a rapidly increasing student population compounded with decreased state funding. Under the direction of the local school board, strategies had been developed that guaranteed facilities, curricular opportunities, and support services to exceptional students at least equal to those provided for students in the mainstream. One expected outcome of these strategies was that students completing eighth grade would demonstrate a knowledge of employability skills and positive work attitudes.

Description of Local School and Population

This practicum was developed within an elementary school located in a middle-class neighborhood. With a student body of approximately 800 pupils, the school anticipated additional growth based on redistricting and changing neighborhood demographics. This school's regular student

population had continually met county objectives for improved student scores on national, state, and local measures. Specific learning disabilities (SLD) students made up approximately 10% of the school's population. The service delivery system for SLD students offered a continuum of services from 12 hours, the maximum part-time allotment, to zero hours, for students who, although identified as SLD, received no services.

Writer's Work Setting and Role

The author was the senior Specific Learning Disabilities teacher on a newly formed team consisting of two teachers of SLD students and one teacher who taught both emotionally handicapped students and SLD students. Specializing in working with children in grades one through three, the author's instructional background included intensive training in multi-sensory teaching techniques and program development for self-contained language learning disabled children.

Second grade mildly handicapped learning disabled students and their teachers were targeted for inclusion in this practicum. These students' Individual Educational Plans (IEP's) reflected a range of hours from zero to ten. The students were grouped heterogeneously for homeroom, with an average class size of 27, and more homogeneously for mathematics instruction. Their teachers were experienced in team teaching and cooperative planning for regular education students. One second grade teacher was allocated a majority of children who were functioning below level according to basal tests and consequently began the year with a slightly smaller number of children. A majority of the learning disabled students (11)

who appeared to be functioning at lower levels than their peers at the end of first grade were assigned to this classroom. Other SLD students were integrated into the remaining four second grade classrooms.

CHAPTER II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

There were increasing numbers of mildly handicapped learning disabled elementary students who were failing to exhibit adequate academic gains within their regular education classrooms. These mildly handicapped learning disabled children received special education services through a pull-out service delivery model and were not exhibiting academic gains within their regular education classrooms commensurate with the mastery indicated on their Individual Education Plans (IEP's). It was obvious that a disparity existed between academic achievement exhibited within the classroom and academic achievement attained within the SLD room.

Increasing numbers of referrals to special education indicated that many children were in danger of becoming at-risk students. These children, by first grade, had already begun to feel like school failures. Special education teachers, bound by county, state, and federal mandates, adhered to assessment and placement criteria that has often failed to meet the needs of at-risk children. They were also discovering that the scheduling of direct instructional services to rising numbers of learning disabled students was not efficacious. Classroom teachers, responsible for the academic enlightenment of all their students, were growing increasingly frustrated in their attempts to consolidate or coordinate regular educational goals with the goals of special education. Briefly stated, the pullout service delivery model employed in this county's elementary schools was failing to meet the needs of mildly

handicapped students, at-risk students, regular educators, and special education teachers.

Documentation of the Problem

Evidence of this problem was supported by interviews with classroom teachers, personal observations, and reviews of students' individual educational plans and classroom records. Classroom academic records did not reflect attainment of specific skills. Placement into the SLD resource room resulted in regression to pre-placement levels in the academic subject for one known student and possibly for others. A classroom teacher related, "_____ has gone backward in math. He can't do problems now that he could do at the beginning of the year." Student grades in Science and Social Studies failed to reflect generalization of skills attained in the SLD room. Teachers reported a lack of systematic data upon which to judge students' acquisition of skills presented in the resource room or to ascertain whether certain techniques were effective. One teacher commented, "I never see anything written from his special class." County SLD curriculum guides and standardized testing determined short term objectives. Classroom teachers did not appear to be part of this process. The objectives were generated prior to placement and continued in effect until the next IEP review. Instructional techniques and materials remained static throughout the year and appeared unrelated to program evaluation. A computer math program, which failed to produce the expected increase in computation skills, continued to be utilized as a student's primary instructional method. SLD students were reading texts within the SLD resource room that were

not commensurate with their instructional level. "_____ was successfully reading SRA basic skills text E in my class, but now that he's in the SLD resource room, he's reading in book C."

Mildly handicapped SLD students were burgeoning special education classrooms. Averaging 10% of this writer's elementary school's population, these SLD students received services along a continuum from 0 to 12 hours. Although each grade level included many exceptional students, second grade with 20 students scheduled for instruction in the primary SLD resource program, comprised the majority of the SLD caseload. Many students spent a portion of each day in one or more special education classes. These included: language, speech, and hearing, occupational therapy, learning disabilities, or emotional handicapped placements. This caused disruptions in classroom flow and instructional integrity.

Communication, coordination, and scheduling problems between various resource rooms and students' classrooms acerbated continuity between regular and special education. Many teachers expressed a lack of confidence in their ability to modify classroom materials or adapt teaching techniques to match the learning styles of learning disabled students. They were concerned that mildly handicapped learning disabled students did not maintain the pace of regular classroom instruction. Once teachers completed a referral packet, they were not contacted until the formal eligibility staffing occurred. Asked about concerns, one teacher responded, "We need more communication, ... consistency between teachers." Teachers, who had not been asked to contribute to or assist in the evaluation of goals, stated that

they wanted to contribute to the development of their students' IEP's. Teachers were not aware of what transpired within the SLD resource room except for "the usual popcorn parties" and "spelling test" on Friday. A teacher remarked, "I don't feel very involved in what happens in _____'s special class." Classroom teachers shared the frustration that they and their SLD students felt over existent problems in the classroom. Comments included: "He has made no progress this year." "My SLD students felt they didn't need to do classroom work." "I don't want him to use the SLD label as an excuse." Other teachers complained that SLD students frequently forgot homework and had difficulty with written assignments. Writing samples reflected this difficulty.

Causative Analysis

The dichotomy that existed between many SLD students' classroom academic goals and their IEP goals had prevented educati nal synergism from occurring. Academic mastery of resource curriculum was based on the assessment of skills pre-determined by student placement along a continuum of this county's adopted SLD curriculum. SLD students were not progressing because their mastery of academic content of the learning disabilities curriculum was not generalizing into the regular classroom. Concomitantly, their classroom academic deficit areas were not being directly addressed within the SLD resource room. Divergent spelling lists, alternative reading texts, and insufficient attention to attainment of written language skills prevented adequate skill growth. Although McLeod and Armstrong (1982) cite incidences as high as 2/3 of learning disabled students

also exhibiting problems in math, from an SLD population of 85, only two resource students received services in this academic area. Traditional assessment techniques and goal oriented philosophies were proving ineffective in providing timely feedback for ascertaining skill maintenance or determining need for modification of instruction. Skills were assessed in small group or individual settings using objective tests that provided a variety of student responses but were limited to specific SLD curriculum areas. There was no concomitant assessment directed toward determining skill acquisition and maintenance within the regular classroom. Norm-referenced tests, administered yearly, were utilized as indicators of achievement gains. Armbruster, Stevens, and Rosenshine (1977) cast doubt on the relationship between student performance and standardized achievement tests in reading.

Data indicates the greatest increase in the number of children identified as handicapped has occurred in the area of learning disabilities (Hagerty & Abramson, 1987). Learning disabilities teachers' case loads are escalating. O'Neil (1988) cites an incidence rate of 4.4 million mildly handicapped individuals in 1986 with a 140% increase for learning disabilities since 1976. Improved identification techniques, renewed commitment to educating at-risk children, and increased attention to the individualization of instruction have also contributed to higher incidence rates in the categories of language, speech, and hearing (LSH) and emotionally handicapped (EH). Mildly handicapped students often qualify for multiple programs, i.e. specific learning disabilities, language, speech,

and hearing, occupational therapy (OT), or emotionally handicapped. At this writer's school site, children identified as SLD, LSH, OT, or EH were serviced within separate resource rooms with no attempt made to coordinate academic consistency between these programs.

Classroom teachers indicated a need for more contact between special education and regular education. There was little systematic contact between regular classroom teachers and special education teachers. Nor was a procedure in place to promote systematic informal conferences between regular classroom teachers and special education teachers. Teachers lacked a vehicle through which to ascertain information on students already in a program and those that were in the referral process. Students who were at-risk for failure but who did not qualify for special education had no access to the individually designed instruction offered by special education. Classroom teachers were not encouraged to develop ownership or responsibility for setting, implementing, or assessing IEP goals. There had been no in-service workshops to promote understanding of learning disabilities or to present alternative instructional techniques. Grade level teams formed individual systems with special education remaining a separate entity. As a traditional pullout program, the service delivery model for working with specific learning disabled students, was not conducive to special and regular education interaction. The systems remained philosophically and operationally detached.

Review of the Literature

As American schools begin to implement programs to ensure success

under the America 2000 directive, most special education programs are still trying to maximize the benefits of P.L. 94-142 ("America 2000", 1991). Under the provisions of this law handicapped children must receive an education in the least restrictive environment that is individualized, free, and appropriate, (Rothstein, 1990). In the nearly two decades since enactment of P.L. 94-142, special education has expanded and enhanced the law's intent. Service delivery systems for handicapped students encompass several designs ranging from self-contained special education classes to inclusion, a policy in which handicapped students stay within age appropriate regular classrooms. Stainbeck and Stainbeck (1984) argue that separation of special and regular education is discriminatory, costly, and poorly supported by research. Carlberg and Kavale (1980) concur but suggest that although mildly retarded and slow learners have benefited from inclusion, learning disabled students have gained more from special class placement. Two models, the pullout model and the consultative model, show the most promise in meeting the needs of mildly handicapped learning disabled children.

There is substantial research on the efficaciousness of the pullout model. This service delivery system provides individual children or small groups of children with more concentrated attention (Bossert & Barnett, 1981; Hagerty & Abramson, 1987). Remediation typically occurs in a separate resource center. Bossert and Barnett (1981), Fuchs, Fuchs, Hamlett, and Whinnery (1991), and Ramey (1990) ascertain the pullout model to be more effective in increasing gains in reading and math than computer assisted

instruction (CAI) or tutoring. A consistently scheduled pullout program may also result in smaller class size for specific subjects giving regular education students more opportunity for academic engagement. Heron and Harris (1987) and Marston (1988) establish the benefits of increasing opportunities of response for both learning disabled and nonlearning disabled students. Learning disabled students typically do not make intuitive leaps in acquiring new skills without systematic direct instruction. To bolster SLD students' weak generalization skills, O'Neil (1988) suggests that appropriate interventions include specific focus on learning strategies to facilitate transfer of information into the classroom. Madden and Slavin (1987) add that the most efficient special education classes use a diagnostic-prescriptive approach, tutoring, and CAI. Mazzola (1989) concludes a pullout program is more effective in producing achievement especially in the primary grades. She proposes that early intervention in the form of remediation in basic skills is effective for avoiding failure. She cautions that results are not as evident in the intermediate grades. Resource rooms using a pullout approach have evidenced high rates of learning, especially when controlled for methods of instruction. Marston (1988) finds student achievement almost doubling when students are taught in resource rooms instead of in regular classes. Resource rooms offering frequent drill, direct instruction, and structure may better match the learning styles of mildly handicapped students. Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, and Lesar (1991) state that regular education teachers perceive themselves as less able to meet the needs of mildly handicapped students. Results indicate teachers feel these students would experience

greater difficulties in the classroom without assistance from special education. This study clearly proposes the benefits of maintaining a pullout program for those students who cannot benefit from indirect services. Goor and Polhill (1991) provide additional evidence that content area teachers may lack the expertise or time to modify materials and techniques. Jenkins and Heinen (1989) conclude that students may actually prefer a pullout service delivery system and seem to acknowledge the emotional, social, and academic benefits of working with a specialist (Bossert & Barnett, 1981).

Research also supports a rationale for a consultative service delivery system in which instruction occurs within regular education classes under the guidance of a consultant (Idol, 1988; Will, 1986). Proponents of the consultative model advocate a restructuring of special education toward an integrated approach with regular education so that all children might benefit (Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987; Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1986; Yau, 1988). Individual interventions might be suggested for all students who can learn but who differ along a continuum of skills and achievements (Stainbeck & Stainbeck, 1984; Guthrie, 1989). The basic instructional validity of the pullout model has also been questioned (Wesson & Deno, 1989). Given that learning disabled students do not easily generalize, serious concerns are emerging regarding the nature of special education service delivery and its interface with regular education (O'Neil, 1988; Sapon-Shevin, 1987). Several studies address the separateness of special education from regular education and conclude that consultation models are effective for increasing mildly handicapped students' academic skills and social skills

(Heron & Harris, 1987; Idol-Maestas, 1983; Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb, and Nevin, 1986; Miller & Sabatino, 1978; Reisberg & Wolf, 1988; Semmel et al. 1991). Educational experiences within age appropriate environments provide handicapped children more opportunities for richer social interaction than would be available in separate classes. Including motivation as a factor in educational design suggests that unless careful consideration is exercised, children frequently have to eliminate subjects that they enjoy and that offer success in the regular classroom (Taylor, 1985). One of the most often cited problems of the pullout model is the lack of consistency and continuity of curriculum across settings (Hagerty & Abramson, 1987; Idol, 1988; Semmel et al. 1991). Carlson, Ellison, & Dietrich (1984) indicate that in reading comprehension, learning disabled and low-achieving nonlearning disabled students have greater gains within the framework of a consulting model as compared to a pullout system. Consultative programs have been successful in narrowing the academic gap between the resource room and the classroom and reducing disparities in programs caused by categorical restraints. Rather than stress goals based on differences and lowered expectations, outcomes for all students can be measured against grade level performance in each school district's core curriculum ("Blueprint, 2000," 1992). Mildly handicapped students are not realizing the expected benefits from special education and are continuing to drop out of school at higher rates than their nonhandicapped peers (O'Neil, 1988). Of those that remain in school, by the 10th grade, most are performing below the 10th percentile in reading, writing, and math (Hagerty & Abramson, 1987). Communication

between classroom teachers and special education teachers has been recognized as a problem (Evans, 1981). Semmel et al. (1991) indicate that pullout programs actually minimize communication between special and regular education teachers. Duplication of services, led Zvolensky and Speake (1988) to advocate a shared responsibility for students between teachers and specialists. R. Hunt Riegel's (1988) successful model of cooperative consultation is partially based on person to person communication. Regular personal contact between personnel is more easily achieved through in-class remediation and teachers have demonstrated positive reactions to improved communication (Davis, 1982; Hayes, 1983). For regular educators, teaching continuity, scheduling, and class size are often affected by pullout programs (Taylor, 1985).

In attempting to comply with P.L. 94-142 accountability clauses for academic attainment, special education has relied on a variety of methods. Evaluation of students ranges from standardized normed assessment to teacher judgement. Bossert and Barnett (1981) suggest evaluation is consigned exclusively to results without considering methods. This approach does not ensure the kind of accountability that is desired by educators (Wang et al. 1986). Inappropriate evaluation does not comply with emerging state directives to better define and measure progress of students ("Blueprint 2000," 1992). Special education programs that isolate, dilute, and minimize academic achievement will not produce individuals capable of attaining the goals toward which education strives (Sapon-Shevin, 1987). Deno (1985), Deno, Mirkin, Lowery, and Kuehnle (1980), and

Fuchs et al. (1991) have confirmed greater increases in student performance under a treatment oriented strategy rather than a traditional goal directed format. Frequent program modifications based on precision teaching has even proven beneficial in IEP development (Deno, Mirkin, & Wesson, 1984). Reisberg and Wolf (1988) suggest assessment and instructional strategies which have demonstrated effectiveness in helping mildly handicapped students be successful in the mainstream.

Special education expansion is a matter of public record. Between 1976 and 1984 enrollment in special education programs increased 11% (Plisko, 1985). The majority of these children are categorized as learning disabled (O'Neil, 1988; Reynolds et al. 1987). With one in every 10 students currently receiving special education services, coordination between programs and direct services within multiple pullout programs may not be possible within the normal school day (Sapon-Shevin, 1987; Wang et al. 1986). Bossert and Barnett (1981) list conflicts concerning scheduling between regular education and special education as a major impediment to effective cooperation and coordination. Combining the best practices of the pullout and consultative models, Idol (1989) proposes an integrated service delivery system using the resource teacher as both a direct service provider and a classroom consultant.

CHAPTER III

ANTICIPATED GOALS AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

General Goal

The goal of this practicum was to improve the academic status of mildly handicapped second grade learning disabled children. Concomitantly special education instruction and assessment techniques would generalize into regular education classrooms, creating positive responses from the professionals who impact on the education of learning disabled youngsters.

Specific objectives

The following goals and outcomes were projected for this practicum:

1. Students will demonstrate 80% mastery on grade-appropriate reading objectives as measured by curriculum mastery tests.

2. Written language assessment will confirm that SLD students are demonstrating 80% achievement levels of similar skills evidenced by classmates on classroom writing samples.

3. SLD students will demonstrate 80% of the average students' decoding skills attainment level as measured on an individual coding skills test.

4. Second grade learning disabled students will master 80% of the spelling objectives for their grade level as measured on a cumulative review test.

5. On a program evaluation form (See Appendix A), classroom teachers will acknowledge improved communication and consistency of services for their learning disabled students.

6. Classroom observations will indicate that three of the five second grade classroom teachers are implementing modifications in their classroom instruction as suggested within the consultative process.

Evaluation Instruments

Because the presiding goal of the practicum was to improve competence of SLD students within the classroom, this writer elected to evaluate these students on either classroom or curriculum based assessment measures rather than standardized instruments.

Reading comprehension and skill level was assessed using curriculum mastery tests. These tests were administered to all students within the normal testing parameters of the classroom with the following exceptions: the teacher elected to present the test over succeeding days rather than in one or two sessions and the comprehension segment was amended to require completion of two instead of four segments.

Written language was assessed within two second grade classrooms, the R/C class and a similar class, to provide a broader sample base of skill levels. Given a pictorial story starter, each student wrote for ten minutes. Evaluative comparisons were performed between SLD students and students not identified as SLD. Type-token ratio and T-units were used to quantify differences in writing skills (Choate, Enright, Miller, Poteet, & Rakes, 1992).

To measure decoding ability, SLD students from the R/C classroom and non-learning disabled students were assessed on individual coding tests which assessed students' ability to respond to phonic generalizations within specific word patterns. These tests were administered to an equal number of SLD students and non-learning disabled students in the SLD room. Teachers provided the sample of average readers to comprise the non-

learning disabled population.

Spelling acquisition and maintenance was assessed using a cumulative coding skills based format. This assessment measured student ability to recognize and encode common irregular words and to encode sounds into written symbols using spelling rules and generalizations. Students were tested within the classroom setting. Comparisons were performed between SLD and non-learning disabled students.

A survey was administered to all classroom teachers at the conclusion of the practicum so that the general sensitivity of the school toward the ESE department could be assessed (see Appendix A). A similar survey was completed by the R/C regular educator to ascertain the specific value of the practicum.

Informal observations were conducted during the last week of implementation in all second grade classrooms. Anecdotes, written during each classroom visit, were subsequently compared with notations for modifications written on Resource/Consultation Logs (see Appendix B).

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTIONS

Solutions Suggested by the Literature

A debate concerning efficacy of services for handicapped children is neither new nor unique for special education. Studies on paradigm shifts from segregation to inclusion permeate special education research. Most of these studies cautiously support a conclusion that mildly handicapped students are failing to maximize their potential within a traditional pullout service delivery system. Lack of academic growth and a lack of consistent and systematic communication between special and regular education teachers is borne out by the literature. It is the basis of most conflicts over scheduling, ownership of programs, and academic goals. Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb, and Nevin (1986) suggest consultation as a viable option for assisting classroom teachers who have students with learning and behavior problems. This model has been effective at increasing involvement of schools, professionals, and parents, resulting in more direct participation in the education of children. The support services that consultative teachers provide for the regular classroom fosters mutual understanding and sharing of materials and instructional techniques (Idol, et al., 1986 and Keller & Hallahan, 1987). Through in-service activities, teachers learn techniques for assessment and instruction of academic and social behavior that can be used with all low functioning students (Conoley & Conoley, 1982; Guthrie, 1989). Consultation management fosters closer monitoring of students' progress in the classroom and facilitates intervention strategies appropriate to educational

programs. This model, by identifying the basis of students' problems, enables teachers to prevent problems while they remediate others (Idol, 1988; Reisberg & Wolf, 1988). Research indicates resource teachers engage in the indirect service roles of consultation, demonstration teaching, and conducting in-service workshops very seldom even though successful mainstreaming depends on this behavior (Vasa, Steckelberg, & Ronning, 1982). Willing and dedicated teachers, who would accept and espouse the consultative model most easily, are being underused as consultative partners in education (Goor and Polhill, 1991). Most of the service delivery models currently employed are not designed to provide the time necessary for special/regular education interaction even though regular education teachers perceive special education teachers as a resource. Demonstration teaching, viewed as important by regular educators, is seldom an integral part of special education services, even though it can encourage the use of effective teaching strategies that will benefit at-risk and special education students (Goor & Polhill, 1991; Guthrie, 1989; Vasa et al. 1982). Consultation provides for greater flexibility in when and in what quantity services can be provided. Resource teachers attempting to consolidate consultative techniques into their schedules may have some problems. Insufficient job descriptions and lack of administrative support for reduced case load can discourage effective consultative practices (Keller & Hallahan, 1987). The consultative model can be operational under minimum conditions with good time management techniques. Bossert and Barnett (1981) suggest that one day per month could support the model. Efficient meetings, effective

tracking systems, and appropriate feedback are indicated as prerequisites to an operative consultative system. Friend and Bauwens (1988) recommend recording agendas of teacher meetings, in logs or journals, to track dates, times, topics, and outcomes.

Several general issues can be gleaned from the literature: special education labels can be stigmatizing; not all special education classrooms are efficacious; special education is not financially expedient; and, treating children as handicapped may not be humanistic. However, all children deserve experiences that will help them maximize their potential and the research does not exclusively support a decision to abandon traditional service delivery systems. Diversity of studies, funding applicability, and administrative constraints suggest a combination of service delivery systems. The Resource/Consultative (R/C) Model appears to maximize the advantages of special education through two delivery systems: pullout and consultative. This model, originating from both the traditional resource room model and the consulting teacher model, employs the resource teacher in a duel role. Huefner (1988) conceptualizes the resource teacher as a master consulting teacher working to train teachers, implement policies with clear objectives, and coordinate programs with administrative support. Within this model, remediation of basic skills, assessment, and instruction in problem areas relevant to school achievement would occur in the resource room. Indirect services would be provided through teacher conferences, observations, and recommendations for program modifications. Consultation with some direct teaching has led to greater overall academic gains by combining aspects of

direct teaching and consultation that fit the existing school arrangement (Idol, 1989; Schulte,Osborne, & McKinney, 1990; Yau, 1988). This type of program works to ensure the transfer of skills by the SLD students from the resource room to the classroom (Idol, 1989; Yau, 1988). Classroom activities include consultation to provide assistance, support, and advice on problems related to learning and behavior (Idol, 1989). Idol (1988, 1989) and Schulte et al. (1990) list time constraint problems and consideration of student needs as factors in determining appropriate allocation of direct and indirect services. Idol (1988) offers several suggestions for combining direct and indirect instruction which would result in a time ratio of 40% of the week for consultation activities and 60% of the week for resource teaching. Engaging in a consulting role necessitates learning effective consultative behaviors and behaving in a nonjudgemental way toward regular education teachers (Goor & Polhill, 1991; Riegel, 1988). Friend and Bauwens (1988) and Rosenfield (1987) cite resistance to consulting from both resource teachers and classroom teachers. Generally, the receptivity of teachers and administration to the consultative model can be judged by their overall receptivity to change (Dickinson, 1987). The success of innovative practices will depend on how teachers view them, i.e. a challenge or a threat.

Academic gain remains a central issue in any service delivery system. Research proposes several effective academic strategies for application in direct and indirect instructional teaching. Peer tutoring can provide individualized instruction and becomes an effective strategy for increasing skills of both students as well as increasing social acceptance of the

handicapped student (Hershfield, 1991; Heron & Harris, 1987; Rosenfield, 1987). Portfolios have been recommended as a method to increase academic achievement (Collins, 1992; Roemer, Schultz, & Durst, 1991). Described as a collection of evidence, portfolios have been cited as promoting high standards and consistency, especially in the area of writing skills. Edwards (1980) has proposed effective strategies, such as formulating objectives and implementing curricular modifications, for encouraging academic gains in any classroom. Suggested modifications include: adapting content, presenting concepts at lower reading levels, using taped texts, and highlighting texts. Effective teaching strategies include: providing immediate feedback through teacher praise or correction, providing opportunities for visual reinforcement such as charting results, modifying workbook materials, reducing distractions, adapting pace, and promoting overlearning.

An emerging factor related to academic achievement is the use of curriculum based assessment (CBA). Used to define, instruct, and measure academic growth, this technique deserves exclusive focus. Given that measurement of skill acquisition has not proven adequate for assessing academic maintenance, CBA has been proposed as an augmentation or alternative to standardized tests (Blankenship, 1985; Gickling and Thompson, 1985; Mirkin, Marston, &Deno, 1982). Based directly on academic behaviors, CBA provides data on teaching/learning events within the classroom (Boucher, 1982; Bursuck & Lessen, 1987). Achievement in basic skills can be reliably and validly measured using the school's existing curriculum as a source of test items (Deno, 1985). The process of repeated

curricular based measurement makes it a logical choice for evaluation (Blankenship, 1985; Germann & Tindal, 1985). It also conforms to the parameters of optimum measures of evaluation, i.e. it is reliable, valid, simple, efficient, easily understood, and inexpensive (Deno, 1985; Deno, Mirkin, & Chiang, 1982). CBA defines the nature of problems and provides an objective analysis of discrepancies between levels of performance (Germann & Tindal, 1985). Student progress can be communicated in educational terms and related to information that is curriculum referenced, individually referenced, and peer referenced (Deno 1985; Marston & Magnusson, 1985). The behavioral approach of CBA aids in the identification, instructional grouping, and remediation of educational problems (Blankenship, 1985; Germann & Tindal, 1985). Unlike standardized tests, CBA is sensitive to growth in student performance over short time periods (Deno, 1985; Marston & Magnusson, 1985). Focusing on discrepancies between student's performance and specific environmental demands, CBA provides information prior to instruction, immediately following instruction, and periodically throughout the year (Blankenship, 1985; Germann & Tindal, 1985). Implementation of CBA has been found effective in improving educational outcomes in spelling for children with disabilities by increasing student time on task (Deno, 1985; Fuchs et al. 1991; Marston & Magnusson, 1985). Using CBA, teachers engage in more interventions and goal changes. The generation of more specific goals for each skill area pertains to IEP development and long range goal planning (Fuchs, Fuchs, Hamlett, & Allinder, 1991; Marston & Magnusson, 1985).

Standardized tests have been found ineffective for making decisions relevant to modification of daily instruction (Deno, 1985; Gickling & Thompson, 1985). Teachers rely on personal judgement of student performance even though there is a statistical discrepancy between actual performance and what teachers think students can do (Deno, 1985). Student performance, as measured by CBA, emerges as the ultimate criterion measure of program effectiveness (Germann & Tindal, 1985). The intertwining of measurement and instruction inherent in CBA makes it useful for tracking progress in reading (Deno, 1985; Gickling & Thompson, 1985; Marston & Magnusson, 1985). The relevance of CBA to each student's total curriculum implies it could be a valuable instrument in the instruction and assessment of all children.

Solution Strategies

The resource/consulting model of service delivery combines the advantages of specialized instruction from the resource room with the broader learning experiences of the regular classroom in meeting the needs of mildly handicapped elementary students. Employed in a school where team teaching was encouraged and communication was a school-wide goal, this writer felt confident in implementing a resource/consultative model within a targeted second grade. Patterned after models suggested by Idol (1989) and Huefner (1988), the R/C model activities included assessment and instruction of academic skills, attention to behavior problems in the classroom, determination and remediation of academic differences among students in the classroom, teacher and specialist involvement in decision

making, and assistance in modifying curricular materials to facilitate the academic progress of SLD and at-risk students. Direct and indirect services, consisting of instruction, assessment, observations, and consultation were provided by the resource SLD teacher.

Based on Hershfield's (1991) program for Chapter 1 students, a formal peer tutoring assistance program was designed to assist SLD students with sight word acquisition during their regularly scheduled SLD class. SLD students would also be paired with classroom helpers who would provide assistance by organizing materials or reinforcing classroom directions.

Idol (1989) in itemizing the most important aspects of the R/C model includes direct instruction on specific skill deficits, continuous monitoring through CBA, and criterion referenced mastery learning. Mirkin, Marston, & Deno (1982) advocate direct and repeated weekly measurement in reading, spelling, and written work. To provide and maintain academic mastery of these skills, curriculum-based instruction and curriculum-based assessment measures were integrated into a pattern of diagnostic teaching/assessment (Idol, 1989; Mirkin et al. 1982).

Report of Action Taken

Each component of the practicum, although intertwined with other components, developed along sequential strands. The following discourse traces each component as it evolved throughout the practicum.

ESE Team Meetings:

Recognizing the strategic value of co-involvement and co-planning

that would be needed to implement and energize this project, this writer initiated a meeting for all ESE staff, i.e. school liaison, SLD teachers, LSH teacher, and EH teacher. Huefner's (1988) criteria for successful implementation, "equal access to special service for all children, efficient use of staff, and educational excellence within the building" (p. 411) served as a motto for the new consultative paradigm. Employing Heron and Harris' (1987) recommendation on the use of various formats, the presentation included a written critique and an oral description of projected goals. The following agenda was presented:

(1) a rationale for the R/C model
(2) justification and establishment of systematic conferences to enhance coordination and collaboration of ESE staff
(3) development of a consistent tracking system for all students referred to special education
(4) development of student progress forms to indicate student objectives, service delivery provider, student schedule, and student progress
(5) development of program modification presentation for faculty

The limited parameters of the practicum necessitated only minor changes in either mental constructs or practical applications for this cadre of professionals and with few reservations, they embraced the intent of the R/C model. A schedule was established for weekly meetings. Copies of the critique and a brief description of the intent of the practicum were submitted to the principal and to the county Learning Disabilities Specialist.

The school liaison prepared a flow chart to reflect Student Study Team referrals and dispositions of students. Her interest in the inclusionary

practices of the R/C model was evidenced in her intentions to increase her time in classroom activities and the possibility of allocating part of her time to teaching a small class of SLD students.

To meet county time lines for service implementation, students identified as ESE, had begun receiving instruction within traditional pull-out service delivery models prior to the start of this practicum. Following the first ESE meeting, this writer met separately with the LSH clinician and the other SLD teachers to arrange schedules for shared students. Students' schedules, if possible, were designed to facilitate movement between their classrooms and ESE classes to reduce fragmentation of instruction. SLD resource teachers then met separately to cooperatively design student schedules to reflect a paradigm shift to the consultative model. Less emphasis was placed on categorical labels than on flexibility and effectiveness of scheduling (Zvolensky & Speake, 1988). Students were distributed between three SLD teachers according to academic and scheduling demands. This writer's caseload was structured to incorporate the smaller number of first and third graders to maximize the potential for the success of the R/C model with the second grade.

By the third week, time constraints suggested bi-monthly meetings and this altered schedule remained in effect for the duration of the practicum. Attendance at meetings fluctuated according to time of year and schedule demands. One member of the original ESE team, after announcing his impending retirement, concluded his participation in all school activities. The regular meetings proved beneficial in integrating his replacement both into

general school expectations and the particular idiosyncrasies of the ESE department. Adhering to an agenda at all meetings resulted in well paced and informative sessions.

These regularly scheduled interactions provided a sense of cohesiveness and unity among three disparate disciplines. Experienced staff members provided guidance and helpful hints in organization and time management. The ESE team was better able to track and service students who had been identified for more than one exceptionality. Standardized assessment schedules were suggested and rotated between SLD teachers to provide the most consistent teaching schedule to students. Although informal contact occurred naturally during the school day, this scheduled format led to an increased sharing of ideas, brainstorming of scheduling solutions, and a more systematic approach to handling student and teacher issues.

Presentation to Faculty:

This writer formally presented the R/C model to the school faculty during a regularly scheduled staff meeting. At that time ESE staff philosophy and goals were shared and invitations extended to encourage faculty collaboration. Communication, shared responsibility, and co-planning were stressed as important factors in program design since teachers' willingness to engage in consultation is a factor in the success of the program (Idol, 1989). Several teachers at this time expressed an interest in having a series of workshops on learning disabilities. "In five minutes I learned more about learning disabilities than I ever knew." "Your presentation on Friday was

excellent. Do you have more info (sic) you could share?" "Your presentation at the staff meeting was organized, well planned and had relevant information. It even contained a bit of humor. Good job!" As a result of this interest, this writer in collaboration with the Professional Development Center (PDC) and The Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resource Systems (FDLRS) arranged a series of workshops entitled, "Help, I've got an LD kid in my room!" Of the 23 teachers who expressed an interest in a workshop presentation, 18 completed the series to earn in-service credit toward re-certification. The workshop was presented on successive Thursdays, approximately half-way through this practicum, and lasted seven weeks. The format embraced flexible scheduling, refreshments, and co-creation techniques. Sessions were offered on alternate mornings and afternoons, and were video taped for absent participants. A "Money Basket" provided volunteer funds for either breakfast items or after-school snacks. Participants were requested to submit ideas or questions that they would like offered in the workshop series. Using the results of an informal brainstorming session, this writer with a co-teacher orchestrated presentations that were suggested by current needs. Sessions included videos on learning disabilities, guest presenters on attention deficit disorder (ADD), the role of the Occupation Therapist, and the Consultative/Resource service delivery model, and demonstration teaching using visual, kinesthetic, auditory, and visual materials. FDLRS presented the videos and guest speakers. Reaction to the workshops was positive and encouraging. Activity evaluation forms indicated interest in a continuing series of

workshops and a willingness to modify classroom instruction and materials to better meet the needs of learning disabled students.

As a general introduction to the R/C model and to enhance awareness of learning disabilities, several activities were planned during the first month of the practicum. This writer visited classrooms and provided a brief description of the SLD class and the learning differences that make all children unique. A video was broadcast school-wide to increase awareness of learning disabilities and some of the problems that learning disabled students encounter in the classroom. Teachers, parents, and students expressed appreciation for the video and several teachers stated that classroom discussions had been beneficial. A parent, whose child was subsequently identified as learning disabled, stated that the video provided the anticipatory set which facilitated the referral/placement process. An "open-house" week, in which SLD students could bring a friend to class with them, was planned to coincide with the presentation of the video. This "Bring a Friend Day" was very successful. Popcorn and drinks were provided as students investigated activities and games that had been prepared in advance. Comments from the guests included: "This looks just like a regular room." "This is fun." "Can we come again?" Although teachers were invited to attend during their planning period, none accepted the invitation. During the final month of the practicum, another "Bring a Friend Day" was scheduled. Ice cream sundaes were provided and conversation encouraged. Students brought classroom friends, parents, and siblings. Students who had just been identified for placement the next year

were contacted and invited. Conducted over a period of three days to facilitate the large number of students within the SLD program, the occasion was deemed a success by students and parents who indicated they were already anticipating next year's "Bring a Friend" activity. The R/C team co-planned an ice cream party for the entire classroom.

Presentation to targeted grade:

This writer prepared an in-depth presentation to introduce second grade teachers to the R/C model. Verbal affirmation to meet was readily given by these targeted teachers but specific dates were difficult to obtain. Communication by memo resulted in an invitation to attend a second grade team meeting. At this introductory meeting the Riegel Cooperative Consultation (Riegel, 1988) model for elementary students was discussed. The goals of this presentation were to:

(1) establish the parameters of the resource/consultative model as it pertained to second grade.
(2) present the possibility of working with at-risk students not currently placed within an ESE category.
(3) organize structure and schedule of future monthly meetings.
(4) recruit one volunteer to participate in a R/C model.

The large numbers of SLD students entering the second grade had already elevated the anxiety level of these caring, responsive teachers. Concerned with meeting the curricular demands placed on regular students while attempting to provide extra assistance for SLD students, these teachers

were receptive to the R/C model. They expressed a willingness to support and collaborate on the restructuring of the current design. This team expressed appreciation for the chance to discuss not only their identified SLD students but students who were not progressing adequately through the regular curriculum. Although not all second grade teachers were able to attend all meetings, those that did used this opportunity to discuss teaching strategies and alternative modifications, resolve scheduling conflicts, and arrange classroom visits for this writer to observe students. This team of teachers agreed to meet with this writer once a month during their regularly scheduled team meeting. Using Price, Kane, Bowman, and Ness' (1982) suggestion that meetings follow a structured, organized, time efficient format, agendas were prepared and distributed to teachers prior to meetings. These meetings were formatted to encompass a dual purpose: to follow the school-based staff assistance format to provide assistance to all students; and, to provide collaboration on currently placed SLD students.

The following generic agenda was used:

(1) Teachers request assistance with any student.
(2) Team discusses student, makes recommendations, enters data on student progress form.
(3) A member of the team (or ESE staff) is scheduled to observe, or collect additional information.
(4) Student discussed at follow-up meeting.
(5) Collaborate on SLD students following Riegel's Cooperative scope and sequence.
(6) Analyze current short term and long range IEP goals and implementation of instruction.

Every teacher on this team brought concerns about specific students to these monthly meetings. These teachers were provided modifications or behavior management techniques, or were directed to appropriate personnel. Suggestions were noted on a resource/consultative log (see Appendix B). This experienced team followed the school's established format for requesting observations and noting student strengths and weaknesses when indicated for student referral packets. Because the team seemed to prefer a more informal procedure for student discussions and since the team was not participating in the specific pilot program, this writer opted not to formalize student descriptions using Riegel's format for teacher/student descriptive match. General alternative modifications were discussed as was classroom progress toward IEP goals.

The Establishment of the R/C Team:

Recruiting a volunteer to participate in the R/C service delivery model was not difficult. The second grade team had already restructured their homeroom classes in an attempt to provide a better student-curriculum match. The basic justification for this restructuring provided the perfect rationale to expand this concept through utilization of the R/C model. A teacher, who had previously volunteered to accommodate below level students within a smaller class, requested that she be part of the R/C model. This writer and volunteer teacher (the R/C team) met informally more frequently than the second grade team, especially initially. At least once a week, the R/C team met to establish schedules for in-class remediation, direct service schedules, and for consultative purposes. Because of the large

number of students, 35 in grades one through three, scheduling was a major hurdle in establishing regular and effective classroom visits. After several false starts, a schedule was established that provided in-class contact 30 minutes per day, four days per week. In-class remediation consisted of direct and in-direct instructional services to SLD and at-risk students. The model progressed from teacher directed activities, through SLD teacher directed activities, to shared planning on unit presentations. Initial remediation resembled the more traditional pullout format in that this writer was given several students, SLD and at-risk, to remediate in sight word acquisition in a separate area of the classroom. This format gave way to a more flexible presentation of reading comprehension instruction in which the co-team presented concurrent lessons on different instructional levels. Alternative reading texts were introduced into the classroom during this time period and shortly into the R/C model this teacher requested alternative curriculum materials for reading and language arts instruction for her entire class. Soon most of the students were reading these alternative texts as part of their silent reading activities. The R/C team attended a workshop on consultative practices which facilitated the progression to discussions in which students were evaluated in terms of teacher style/student style match, student/curriculum match, and alternative interventions. The transition to a R/C model from the traditional pullout model required more than scheduling revisions. It also involved changes in the configuration of the regular classroom. Students, SLD and regular, gradually made adjustments to having two teachers in the classroom, learning to be responsive to the

instructing teacher, and accepting the R/C team format as a normal part of the school day. As part of the R/C team, this writer instructed, made modifications in curriculum, and consulted with her partner about SLD students, at-risk students, and students who simply needed additional help in specific activities. By the conclusion of the practicum, team teaching had become an integral part of this R/C model. The R/C team met to plan spelling instruction, language arts sequence, and creative writing activities. This writer was called upon to assist in planning student placement for the following year, advise on curriculum content for next year, and recommendations for best student/teacher matches.

Tutoring:

Tutoring had been conceived as a supportive but not integral facet of the R/C model. Using Idol's (1989) format, the program for second grade students included several steps:

> (1) Plan sessions to model, teach, and have tutors role play different teaching activities such as listening to sight words and oral reading.
> (2) Prepare tutor form to facilitate directions and to monitor activities.
> (3) Plan reward activities for tutors and SLD students to coincide with school recognition days.

Materials were provided for classroom use but time was not available for this writer to offer the assistance needed to fully implement, monitor, and assess peer tutoring activities. Another stumbling block was the teacher's perception that there were no students adequately prepared in the areas to be

remediated to provide consistent feedback to the tutored students. Selecting students from other second grades resulted in scheduling conflicts that appeared unresolvable within the context of this practicum. In attempting to provide more systematic tutoring, cross-age tutoring was investigated. Classroom schedules were not conducive to a systematic program and this writer chose to discontinue this aspect of the practicum.

Curriculum Based Assessment:

Initial baseline data in each area was collected over a 3 to 5 day period prior to and on a systematic schedule throughout remediation (Blankenship, 1985; Germann & Tindal, 1985). Student folders were prepared containing charts and assessment items for reading, spelling, and written language. Reading was assessed using grade-appropriate reading passages and individual coding skills tests. To ascertain fluency, students read orally for one minute. Coding skills were determined through analysis of words correctly read within one minute from a list of phonetically correct words. Student progress forms (see Appendix C) were completed for each SLD second grade student. Direct instruction, using CBA methodology, was implemented in the SLD resource room. Assessment was conducted bi-monthly, with appropriateness of instruction determined by inspection of the charted results (Marston & Magnusson, 1985). Ten average second graders were assessed on an individual coding skills test at the conclusion of this practicum to ascertain average mastery levels. Fluency rates were analyzed using a test-retest format in which each SLD student was compared to his initial test results. Spelling ability, as defined by the number of correct letter

sequences, number of correctly spelled words, and number of incorrectly spelled words, was charted (Marston & Magnusson, 1985). Initial testing of spelling skills using a list of 20 randomly selected grade appropriate words dictated within a 2 minute time frame revealed severe spelling deficits for all of the targeted second grade SLD students. Counting the number of correct letter sequences did not translate effectively into classroom expectations and was discontinued within a few weeks. Charting continued as a viable tool for comparisons between the number of correctly spelled words and the number of misspelled words. The Deno et al. (1980) method of test-study-test was suggested to the classroom teacher as an alternative presentation of spelling instruction. Under this format, only words missed on the first day of testing were to be studied during the week. Because this intervention was attempted early in the implementation of this practicum, before full co-teaching was enacted, it was not successful. The reservations of the classroom teacher and her unfamiliarity with this method resulted in the discontinuation of this modification shortly after it was initiated. The expectations inherent in the spelling curriculum resulted in these SLD students maintaining a separate spelling program within the SLD room. Written language was assessed by evaluating students' writing within established parameters. Type-token ratio and T-units were charted as a measure of fluency using ten minutes as a given time unit (Choate, Enright, Miller, Poteet, & Rakes, 1992). Every four weeks, appropriateness of instruction was ascertained by an inspection of ratio and T-units. Writing samples were collected from the classroom and the SLD room. During

initial assessment, student progress forms were completed to reflect: baseline data, instructional objectives, teaching/learning procedures, and relevant dates. Student progress data was added systematically to aid in instructional decision-making concerning the adequacy of intervention (Idol, 1989). Reports were generated to reflect acquisition/maintenance of skills.

Direct Instruction:

Direct instruction consisted of academically focused teacher-directed activities sequentially moving toward specific goals, structured materials, sufficient time allocation, extensive coverage of content, continuous monitoring of student's performance, and immediate feedback (Idol, 1989). Because teacher and student feedback is an important consideration of CBA, the SLD teacher and student conferenced frequently to evaluate progress and project continuing instructional needs. Coupled with regular teacher conferences, these sessions ascertained skill acquisition and transference to the regular education classroom and formed the initial basis of in-class remediation (Collins, 1992). A written analysis of these conferences, i.e. a copy of the student progress form, was provided to classroom teachers.

Informal Observations:

Informal observations within each second grade class were used to monitor student participation in classroom activities and to generate suggestions for academic modifications. Through these observations it was possible to note teachers' participation in modifications or alternative curriculum activities.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results

Mildly handicapped learning disabled elementary students were failing to exhibit adequate academic gains within their regular education classrooms. The existent pullout service delivery model was inadequate for responding to the expectations of the regular education classroom. A disparity that existed between academic achievement exhibited within the classroom and academic achievement attained within the SLD room was detrimental to student progress. Classroom teachers and special education teachers recognized a need to consolidate or coordinate regular and special educational goals. The pullout service delivery model was incapable of meeting the needs of mildly handicapped students, at-risk students, regular educators, and special education teachers. The potential for combining the inherent benefits of specialized instruction congruent with resource room programs with the broader learning experiences of regular education classrooms prompted the development of the resource/consultative service delivery model.

The goal of this practicum was to improve the academic status of mildly handicapped second grade learning disabled children. This writer hypothesized that special education instruction and assessment techniques would generalize into regular education classrooms resulting in increased collaboration and communication between regular and special education. Specific objectives were generated to facilitate direction and evaluation.

Objective 1: Students will demonstrate 80% mastery on grade-appropriate reading objectives as measured by curriculum mastery tests.

Entry assessment data on these learning disabled students suggested that this objective would be difficult to meet and the subsequent failure to do so was confirmed on curriculum mastery tests. All of the students in the targeted classroom entered second grade two or more levels below grade expectancy. This inadequate knowledge base proved too difficult to overcome within the time constraints of this practicum. As indicated in Table 1, none of the SLD students attained 80% mastery level on the grade level test.

Table 1
Curriculum Mastery Test Results

	Performance Percentages		
	>80%	<80% - >65%	<65%
SLD[a]	0	1	10
NSLD[b]	5	3	5

Note. N = 24. [a]SLD (students identified as learning disabled): n = 11. [b]NSLD (students not identified as learning disabled): n = 13.

The low number of non-learning disabled students that failed to achieve greater than 80% reflected the suppressed academic level of this class. The extent and magnitude of the below 65% achievement level, suggest the curricular problems that beset both the SLD and the non-learning disabled students within this class.

In rank ordering the test results, SLD students can be seen to compare

more similarly to their classroom peers. Table 2 categorizes test scores into a sequential arrangement. Although more NSLD students scored above 70%, the lowest percentage scores were shared by an SLD student and a NSLD student. An equal number of SLD and NSLD scored within 60-69%.

Table 2
Curriculum Mastery Test Results: Rank Order

Scores[a]	SLD[b]	NSLD[c]
100-90		4
80-89		1
70-79		1
60-69	3	3
50-59	4	2
40-49	3	1
30-39	1	1

Note. [a]Scores are given in percentages. N = 24. SLD students: n = 11. [c]NSLD students: n = 13.

> Objective 2: Written language assessment will confirm that SLD students are demonstrating 80% achievement levels of similar skills evidenced by classmates on classroom writing samples.

The expectation of this objective was surpassed for many of the SLD students. Six SLD students achieved 90% of the mean achievement level of their non-learning disabled peers on classroom writing samples. Two SLD students achieved 72% of the mean and two more achieved 60%. Although no SLD student scored below 50% of the mean, 68% of the mean was the lowest score attained by a NSLD student. Two measures of achievement

were performed on the writing samples. Type token ratios (TTR) were used to indicate the correct spellings of words as compared to total number of words and T-units were used to indicate complete thoughts (Choate et al. 1992). Although TTRs provided a picture of the mechanical aspects of written language, T-units reflected the higher order thinking skills involved in creative or process writing. Table 3 illustrates the comparative range of students' scores on both TTR and T-units.

Table 3

Written Language Assessment Comparisons

SLD[a]		NSLD[b]	
TTR[c]	T-Units	TTR	T-Units
88	2	95	3
87	4	85	2
85	3	81	3
77	1	77	3
73	2	76	3
69	3	70	3
50	5	70	3
50	3	69	3
42	2	68	3
41	4	67	3
36	5	53	2
M = 63.45	M = 3.09	47	3
		47	2
		M =69.6	M = 2.76

Note. [a]SLD students: n = 11. [b]NSLD students: n = 13. [c]TTR = type token ratio.

The reader is enjoined to notice the range differential between the SLD and the NSLD student scores. Although many SLD students attained the expected 80% mastery level in written skills, their individual performance levels fell within and below the individual levels of their peers. An unexpected result of this objective was the higher T-unit mean achieved by the SLD students. An inspection of the table reveals that for T-units the SLD students' individual scores, except in one instance, ranked higher or equal to those of the NSLD students.

> Objective 3: SLD students will demonstrate 80% of the average students' decoding skills attainment level as measured on an individual coding skills test.

This objective was attained by five SLD students. Table 4 indicates that although two more students achieved scores of 66, they failed to make the cut off score of 70.6. NSLD students showed greater differential in their responses (110 points) but SLD students continued to evidence lower overall ability.

Recommendations for interpretation of this instrument note that students able to decode between 40 - 80% evidence some skill level in decoding ability. Students averaging between 80 - 100% would most likely be able to decode any word they encounter. Five SLD and eight NSLD students evidenced some skill level. No students scored in the optimum skill level range of 80-100%. Five SLD and eight NSLD students averaged between 40 - 80%. Five SLD and four NSLD students averaged less than 40%. The average decoding ability for NSLD students was 46% compared

to that of SLD students who averaged 42.8%. Briefly stated, nine students evidenced no decoding ability and 13 demonstrated some decoding ability.

Table 4
Individual Coding Skills Test Results

SLD[a] # correct	NSLD[b] # correct	SLD %	NSLD %
134	166	70	74
112	125	59	72
102	119	54	63
94	99	49	52
78	97	41	51
66	82	35	46
66	80	35	42
63	79	33	42
58	73	31	38
41	72	21	38
M = 81.4	62		33
	56		29
	M = 88.25		

Note. Maximum score = 190. N = 22. [a]SLD students: n = 10. [b]NSLD students: n = 12.

Objective 4: Second grade learning disabled students will master 80% of the spelling objectives for their grade level as measured on a cumulative review test.

Table 5 reveals that this objective was not achieved by any students within the targeted classroom. All but one SLD student scored at or lower than 50% whereas nearly half of the NSLD students scored better than 50%. This indication confirms the expected differential between scores of spelling

ability for SLD and NSLD students. A change in format is suggested as a possible contributor to the overall low scores. Spelling had always been assessed using a review, practice test, test format. This writer was interested in a cumulative spelling assessment that would indicate internalization of spelling rules and visual recall of frequently used sight words. The results of this testing indicate little internalization of rules or visual recall for this class of second graders.

Table 5

Cumulative Spelling Test Results

SLD[a] %	NSLD[b] %
72	78
50	65
43	63
40	57
40	55
38	52
37	42
37	40
35	40
30	40
17	35
	30
	28

Note. N = 24. [a]SLD students: n = 11. [b]NSLD students: n = 13.

Objective 5: On a program evaluation form (See Appendix A), classroom teachers will acknowledge improved communication and consistency of services for their learning disabled students.

Responses on the teacher evaluation form confirmed the successful attainment of this objective. Communication was given excellent ratings by 9 of the 14 teachers who responded. Four teachers considered communication to be at least average. Consistency of services was interpreted from responses to questions 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 and was noted as average or excellent by all but one teacher.

Table 6
TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

	UN: # of responses	AV: # of responses	E: # of responses
1. Have you had adequate support to enable you to maximize the education of your ESE student(s)?	0	4	10
2. Have you found the ESE staff receptive to your concerns?	0	3	11
3. Has communication with the ESE staff been satisfactory?	1	4	9
4. Have you learned any new procedures from the ESE staff?	1[a]	0	12
5. Do you feel ESE course work compliments the school's curriculum?	1	3	10
6. Have you been satisfied with the ESE services provided this year?	0	4	10

Note. UN = Unsatisfactory. AV = Average. E = Excellent. N = 14. [a]One teacher did not respond to this question.

The survey requested that teachers expand their responses by stating "why or why not" they were satisfied with ESE services. Teacher comments included the following:

** I have seen great improvements in my ESE students this year. (SLD)
** Much improved. Time on task increased. (SLD)
** ... missing too many hours in LSH, OT, some LD. (SLD 1st, LSH/OT 2nd)
** Not consistent between all ESE resource staff. Some "pullouts" quite successful with students gaining academic knowledge. Some are not. (SLD & EH)
** I had a very hard time this year with getting the testing done that I needed. I was always getting excuses about other things that had to come first (gifted testing?). Is there not a time-line ESE must conform to? Why does the classroom teacher always have to push to get things done? Who is the person in charge to see if things are getting done? (LSH & OT)
** More contact with EH resource needed - more follow-up of what we are doing in class.
** My team and I wish that the EH program could involve role playing to help the EH child know how to handle situations.
** Faster processing - packets are taking much too much time and students are missing valuable service!
** More communication with parents and teachers. Please leave plans when you are absent and give us some notice of the days you will be gone if possible. (Note. Packets were given to all intermediate teachers/ primary teachers were always given option of SLD work)

Teachers were also asked to respond to the following question: What improvements need to be made to provide better special education service to you and your students?

** Another workshop perhaps!
** The new movement of ESE into the classroom seems to be positive to me.

Although the responses of the total staff were important in evaluating the quality of ESE services, the response of the R/C teacher validated the successful formation of the R/C team. The unequivocal positive responses from the R/C teacher assigned credibility to the new model. Table 7 denotes excellent responses in all areas.

Table 7

R/C Teacher Evaluation Form

	UN: # of responses	AV: # of responses	E: # of responses
1. Have you had adequate support to enable you to maximize the education of your ESE student(s)?	0	0	1
2. Have you found the ESE staff receptive to your concerns?	0	0	1
3. Has communication with the ESE staff been satisfactory?	0	0	1
4. Have you learned any new procedures from the ESE staff?	0	0	1*
5. Do you feel ESE course work compliments the school's curriculum?	0	0	1
6. Have you been satisfied with the ESE services provided this year?	0	0	1*

* Note. Marked above Excellent

Although this teacher did not comment as to why she was satisfied with ESE services, she did comment on improvements:

** I would like more courses and information and materials both for me and the students.

Objective 6: Classroom observations will indicate that three of the five second grade classroom teachers are implementing modifications in their classroom instruction as suggested within the consultative process.

As noted in Table 8, four of the five second grade classroom teachers had implemented some modifications that had been generated during team meetings and informal discussions, thus surpassing the criteria for this objective. Alternative materials in use included phonics based text books and teacher made language arts games. Contracts had been implemented for two students: one student was on a classroom behavior acquisition and maintenance contract and one student was being monitored for organizational behaviors. Peer helpers, although not specifically noted as such, seemed to be proximity based in that teachers repeatedly used neighbors of the SLD students to assist in a variety of ways from getting out the correct materials to following directions for completing assignments. Teachers were observed writing directions on the board, using charts, and combining visual/auditory stimuli. Teachers with greater numbers of SLD students implemented modifications in their spelling programs. The R/C teacher replaced the school's spelling curriculum with a phonics based regimen. One teacher continued to use the school's spelling curriculum but

modified instruction to present spelling rules and patterns that had been presented during the workshop. The R/C teacher modified testing by providing more time and by reading all math problems to her class. She also modified the pace and sequence of instruction by letting class mastery dictate time spent on any one concept and by altering sequence of instruction to present a more logical step-by-step introduction to reading elements. Desk arrangements and desk/student match had been given low priority by these teachers. Students were allowed to choose seating arrangements and desks were frequently rearranged within the classroom. One teacher recognized the difficulty this created for her distractible student and with his full approval let him choose a spot in the room that would provide reduced distraction. The R/C teacher had many students in desks that were too large, too cluttered, and located in high distractibility areas. These problems had been ameliorated by the conclusion of this practicum. The R/C teacher, in recognizing the difficulties SLD students have with certain tasks, modified her requirements without lowering her expectations. Students were expected to do their best, but were provided with alternative response modes such as illustrating book reports or doing oral presentations. Table 8 provides specific data illustrating the extend and choice of modifications that were observed within classrooms.

Table 8
Classroom Modifications

T[b]	# SLD	Modifications[a]								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A	1									
B	1		*							
C	1		*	*					*	
D	4	*				*				
E[c]	11	*			*	*	*	*	*	*

Note. [a]Modifications:

1 alternative materials used
2 Contract used
3 peer helpers
4 modified directions
5 spelling modifications
6 modified testing
7 modified pace of instruction
8 desk arrangement/size
9 modified response mode

Note. [b]Second Grade Teachers: N = 5. [c]R/C co-team teacher.

Although routinely administered standardized assessment procedures indicated the SLD students within the targeted classroom evidenced improved academic status, thereby meeting the general goal of this practicum, objectives identifying specific academic outcomes were not entirely satisfied. Of the six objectives stated, two were not realized, two were partially successful, and two were completely accomplished. SLD students were not able to master 80% of their grade level reading curriculum even though all had increased their fluency rates within

alternative text books. Nor were they able to master 80% of the spelling objectives. Partial success can be noted in the categories of acquisition of written language ability and decoding skills. Teacher acceptance, participation, support, and willingness to implement modifications provided the strongest positive results of this practicum.

Discussion

As with most educational research, it is not possible to simply discuss results without addressing the concomitant issues intrinsic to the success of this practicum. Briefly stated each objective of the practicum contributed energy which co-merged into a synergistic change in the model through which the needs of mildly handicapped students were addressed.

Expecting SLD students to achieve reading mastery in a curriculum that had previously failed to meet their needs was a lofty goal. This writer had hoped that by supplementing the curriculum with structured interventions the students would be able to bridge the gap between their ability level and the expectations of the curriculum. The results appear to substantiate Carlberg and Kavale's (1980) conclusion that learning disabled students gain more from special class placement than inclusion. These students, already exhibiting severe deficits in classroom learning, may have benefited more from intensive remediation in an alternative curriculum provided through the traditional pullout model (Mazzola, 1989; Marston, 1988).

The success that some SLD students attained in meeting the written language objective can most likely be attributed to their higher order thinking

skills and the direct teaching methods employed in this construct. Brainstorming and visualizing were annexed to sentence building techniques to provide not only free flowing dialogue but a base to which to anchor these thoughts. The R/C teacher commented that the SLD students wrote stories about a stimulus she had presented compared to her nonlearning disabled students who had written unattached sentences. This difference could be attributed to the increased attention, direct teaching strategies, or multi-sensory teaching techniques common to the SLD room (Marston, 1988; Bossert & Barnett, 1981; Hagerty & Abramson, 1987).

The success of almost half of the SLD students in attaining some proficiency in decoding validates the direct teaching and use of alternative strategies within the R/C model. Semmel et al. (1991) suggested that regular educators felt ill prepared to meet the needs of handicapped students. As this practicum progressed, the integration of specific techniques and methods from the SLD room to the classroom became increasingly evident. The existent curriculum stressed vocabulary acquisition with word attack skills given low priority. The overall low scores of both the SLD and the NSLD students suggest that this approach might not be efficacious for these lower functioning students and that all could benefit from the diagnostic-teaching strategies of the resource room.

Failure of all students to meet the criteria of the spelling objective was unexpected. Although the SLD students were progressing through an alternative spelling program, it was anticipated that they would not reach mastery on the curriculum review test. The failure of the NSLD students to

evidence internalization of spelling rules and generalizations seemed to confirm the suspicions of the classroom teacher that the spelling program was detached from the reading program to such an extent that no connections were made.

Academic responses to objectives for reading, writing, and spelling, provided potential support for the R/C model though they failed to indicate the anticipated success for consultative assistance for SLD students. Improvements within each of these subjects were noted on student progress forms indicating that learning had occurred. This indication of each student's growth surpasses their collective failure to meet group expectations. SLD students are as unique in their learning curves as they are in their learning styles. Changing the venue of teaching does not necessarily change the acquisition of learning.

Scheduled meetings with ESE and regular personnel fulfilled their intrinsic values for expansion of communication and increased involvement of participants. Schedule changes, modifications in teaching techniques, and a greater awareness of exceptional student education ensued from this regular contact. A new staff member commented that the sessions helped her "understand the overall picture of ESE" and to "learn the ropes". The SLD teachers were able to develop and expand teaching methods and techniques as they integrated their different levels of instruction. The EH teacher, who functioned as an SLD teacher, was able to request materials and suggestions for working with SLD students. The meetings proved invaluable in affording a multi-disciplinary vehicle through which to implement the best

program in which to meet students' needs. The liaison commented that she felt "part of a teaching team" and began working in the classroom with two students. ESE teachers, because of interest generated by these bi-monthly meetings, contributed modifications to streamline the current SST format through incorporation of some agenda items. The team met during the last month of implementation and consolidated the tracking system, flow chart, and use of agenda into next year's SST plan.

As the practicum progressed, teachers and students continued to react favorably. Four of the five second grade teachers applied for in-service credit through this writer's workshop. The meetings with regular teachers helped integrate new philosophies, new personnel, and coalesced the R/C team into a successful unit confirming the findings of several studies (Evans, 1982; Semmel et al. 1991; Riegel, 1988). Changes in students' ESE placements, reading levels, and physical space can be attributed to this systematic contact. Students not in the R/C classroom also experienced benefits. One student's ESE placement was modified to reflect increased SLD service and reduced EH service based on teacher descriptions of academic needs and behavior management practices. A second grade SLD student's schedule, modified to reflect improved reading skills, resulted in a move to a third grade SLD service-time in which writing and organizational skills were stressed. The Riegel Consultation student inventory and classroom description forms were employed to develop a better understanding of his strengths and weaknesses so that a contract could be written (Riegel, 1988). Since this student was not in the R/C class, finding

time for monitoring compliance to his contract was a problem. Although the teacher was provided alternative suggestions, this writer was not able to provide hands-on interventionary measures. This student was not able to comply with the organizational demands of the classroom and the contract failed to produce change in his behavior. Meeting with these teachers on a regular basis provided a vehicle through which to share specific information on students and facilitated diagnostic interventions in the classroom behavior of SLD students. Homework modifications, reading comprehension forms, and appropriate reading books were discussed. Impromptu conferences continued to be used to solve immediate problems but the seeds were planted and encouraged for expanding the resource/consultative delivery system during the next school year. This systematic communication venue for addressing concerns was well received by the classroom teachers. They took advantage of these opportunities to discuss students, homework, testing alternatives, parent meetings, and other issues that impacted on their classrooms. Conversely, this writer was better able to monitor the classroom behavior and skill maintenance of SLD students. These meetings generated feelings of shared responsibility toward all children and facilitated the restructuring of additional classrooms during the following year to accommodate the R/C model. Second and third grade teachers jointly met with the R/C team to expedite movement of SLD students from one grade level to the next. Student placement configurations and teacher/student matches were becoming part of the school's dialogue although these issues did not replace more traditional placement factors. A School Improvement

Plan, written during the final months of the practicum, reflected the philosophical acceptance of the school staff to incorporate the resource/consultative service delivery system throughout the ESE paradigm. Incorporated into the plan was a time line and objectives to move toward this service delivery model school wide.

The R/C team meshed into a cohesive unit sharing responsibility and expertise in the planning of classroom activities. Beginning with classroom visits, in-class direct teaching expanded into a regular schedule of four times per week. Initially SLD students had been assigned to this writer's "group" for remediation in sight words and reading comprehension. This group soon expanded to include at-risk students. Within a few months, the teacher requested a schedule change for these visits to expand opportunities for interaction with the entire class on handwriting and punctuation. When a reading assessment revealed deficits in phonic awareness, an opportunity was presented for the team-teaching concept to be fully implemented. Each partner in the R/C team shared responsibility for incorporating decoding skills into the general class curriculum. This was accomplished through consultation, at least one time per week, during which planning and skill sequence was discussed. Lesson plans were generated by both members of the R/C team depending on the concept being introduced. Comments from the R/C team teacher indicated a positive response to the format: "... like the way our system works. ...allows me to meet the demands of classroom while you provide assistance to the students who need extra help." Integrated into the regular classroom were the following concrete examples of what was

philosophically developing: a Language Arts game; a teacher-made vowel pattern book; and, phonic-based songs to practice syllable awareness. Parents who had been introduced to the R/C model informally during open-house week were kept informed of class activities in a class newsletter. Regular education students appeared to benefit from the R/C model as ascertained on curriculum tests. Following the presentation of a specific reading unit, class assessment records indicated that 80% of the class had mastered the current reading level. Two students had acquired the prerequisite skills to enable them to transfer to the appropriate grade level text. A note from the mother of one of these students related to the teacher how much her son's reading techniques had changed: "he cuts words ..... and tries to sound them out." By the conclusion of the practicum this writer was considered a natural part of the classroom. Students encouraged reciprocal visits within the SLD room and the classroom. The demarcation between exceptional student education and regular education seemed to fade as this project progressed. The "Bring A Friend" activities had familiarized most of the students within this room to the SLD resource room. The last "Bring A Friend" activity was relocated to the classroom based on student requests for full classroom participation.

Because of the interest generated regarding consultative teaching, FDLRS offered this writer's school the opportunity to participate in a pilot program to implement cooperative teaming techniques at the elementary level. Three ESE teachers and three regular educators attended a training session midway through the practicum. The second grade teacher, already

part of the R/C team, immediately volunteered for additional training. This interest validated her acceptance and willingness to continue as part of the R/C team. Although not part of the R/C team, another teacher requested inclusion into the model. Attempts to schedule additional class time proved to be impossible and confirmed the difficult position of the resource teacher who fills both the resource and consultative role.

As the R/C model continued to function, interest was noted across grade levels. Third grade teachers requested input on grades, spelling techniques, and syllabication information. A first grade teacher requested alternative workbooks for some of her students who were failing to master classroom objectives in the main curriculum. A fifth grade teacher requested a consultative visit to discuss phonics awareness and techniques for teaching phonics in the classroom and at home.

Tutoring was one projected implementation that did materialize. Perceived as inadequate for peer tutoring by the co-team teacher, the pilot classroom did not lend itself to this activity. Other teachers preferred to assign general helpers rather than specific helpers. In attempting to establish cross-age tutors, a fourth grade student was recruited to work in the SLD room with targeted SLD students. Although successful for two weeks, the student tutor seemed pleased to come and the students he tutored were excited to have a tutor buddy, conflicts in schedules resulted in a discontinuation of this activity. The fact that this writer interacts almost exclusively with primary teachers limited opportunities for interaction and dialogue with intermediate teachers.

Curriculum Based Assessment resulted in instructional guidelines and provided a measurement tool more closely associated with each student's classroom experience. Modifications were enacted in spelling and sight word instruction based on CBA results. CBA fulfilled the promises of initial research by becoming a motivational tool for students as they watched their growth being plotted on spelling a .d reading charts. CBA was not easy to establish however. The potential framework of a total CBA class proved to be beyond the scope of this practicum. Reading fluency and spelling were addressed most easily but CBA measurement for written language will have to wait.

Resource/Consultative Logs indicated a failure to achieve an unstated but expected resource/consultative time usage as suggested by the literature (Idol, 1988). Moving from a pullout program into a very limited R/C model resulted in only a 10% allocation of consultative time and a 90% allocation of traditional resource time. The knowledge that this did represent an incremental change toward the projected model helps mitigate the disappointment of not meeting a more equivalent usage of time.

Several events reflected the overall positive extensions of this practicum. This writer's SLD room was awarded a grant for being named an Exceptional Student Education Model Demonstration Classroom. The interviewing committee expressed interest in the resource/consultative model and noted the importance of combining the expertise of special and regular educators. Having been chosen as a panel member for a presentation on inclusionary practices, this writer was able to share some preliminary data

from this practicum with county SLD teachers and directors. Validation and support for the R/C model was most evident, however, in the fact that this writer's peers named her Teacher of the Year, expressing through their votes support and enthusiasm for this interactive model of teaching.

Enacting changes in the field of education takes more than vision and planning. A critical mass of interested people is necessary to provide the energy and impetus to initiate and maintain the change process. This writer believes that this critical mass was produced through the efforts of this practicum. The R/C model will continue to expand and generate interest in the remediation of mildly handicapped individuals within the parameters of the regular classroom.

Recommendations

1. Administrative support is absolutely critical to the success of this model. Introduction to the benefits and intricacies of the model need to be presented to the school administrator before attempting to implement this model school wide.
2. Training in the R/C model should be continued and expanded. Understanding the model should lead to a commitment to meeting the needs of mildly handicapped individuals within regular class settings. Using the resource teacher as consultant maintains the current budget and facilitates movement and direction between in-class and SLD room services.
3. As the model is expanded, student placement within classrooms becomes critical. Limiting SLD students to two or three classes per grade level will be necessary for service delivery to be consistent and appropriate.

4. Consulting with teachers in classrooms without SLD students should be expanded. Providing modifications, especially in the lower primary grades, can do much to reduce the escalating referral rate to ESE.
5. Including all ESE personnel on campus is critical to maximizing the potential of this model. Consultation should become an integral component of each exceptionality, reducing pullout time and increasing in-class time.
6. ESE personnel need to become familiar with and involved in text book adoption methods and be prepared to recommend alternative materials.
7. Attempts to increase parent involvement in this model should occur as early as possible in the process. Involving parents in the awareness process should increase the SLD student's chances for a successful school career.

Dissemination

This practicum was shared with school and county personnel. Their receptivity and enthusiasm for this project was reflected in their anticipation of its expansion. Panel discussions, including a session at an upcoming Council for Exceptional Children Conference, are projected over the next year.

This writer met with the Executive Director of Exceptional Student Education to discuss the merits of expansion for this program. With caution and sufficient planning, the Director anticipates this county moving toward more inclusionary practices with the R/C model becoming an integral facet of exceptional student education.

This writer anticipates an active involvement in this process.

References

America 2000: An education strategy: Sourcebook. (1991, April). (Contract No, 1991-296-149/40545). Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education.

Armbruster, B. B., Stevens, R. S., & Rosenshine, B. (1977). Analyzing content coverage and emphasis: A study of three curricula and two tests. (Technical Report No. 26). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Center for Study of Reading.

Blankenship, C. S. (1985). Using curriculum-based assessment data to make instructional decisions. Exceptional Children, 52(3), 233-238.

Blueprint 2000: recommended performance standards and outcomes (Draft). (1992, May). Tallahassee: Florida Commission on Education Reform and Accountability.

Boucher, C. R. (1982). Formative testing to teach children with learning problems. Teaching Exceptional Children, 15(5), 177-181.

Bossert, S. T. & Barnett, B. G. (1981). Grouping for instruction, a catalog of arrangements. San Francisco: Par West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 201 052)

Bursuck, W. D. & Lessen, E. (1987). A classroom-based model for assessing students with learning disabilities. Learning Disabilities Focus, 3(1), 17-29.

Carlberg, C. & Kavale, K. (1980). The efficacy of special versus regular class placement for exceptional children: A meta-analysis. The Journal of Special Education, 14(4), 295-309.

Carlson, H. L., Ellison, D., & Dietrich, J. E. (1984). Servicing low-achieving pupils and pupils with learning disabilities: A comparison of two approaches. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 283 341)

Choate, J. S., Enright, B. E., Miller, L. J., Poteet, J. A., & Rakes, T. A. (1992). Curriculum-Based Assessment and Programming. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Collins, A. (1992). Portfolios: Questions for design. Science Scope, 15(6), 25-27

Conoley, J. C. & Conoley, C. W. (1982). School Consultation: A Guide to Practice and Training. New York: Pergamon Press.

Davis, M. (1982). A survey of teacher attitudes towards in-class versus pull-out compensatory reading programs. Master's thesis, Kean College, New Jersey. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 228 619)

Deno, S. L. (1985). curriculum-based measurement: The emerging alternative. Exceptional Children, 52(3), 219-232.

Deno, S. L., Marston, D., & Mirkin, P. (1982). Valid measurement procedures for continuous evaluation of written expression. Exceptional Children, 48(4), 368-370.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., & Chiang, B. (1982). Identifying valid measures of reading. Exceptional Children, 49(3), 36-45.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Lowry, L., & Kuehnle, K. (1980). Relationships among simple measures of spelling and performance on standardized achievement tests. (Report No. 21). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 197 508)

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., & Wesson, C. (1984). How to write effective data-based IEPs. Teaching Exceptional Children, 16(2), 99-105.

Dickinson, V. J. (1987). Attitudes and practices of special day class teachers concerning least restrictive environment. Unpublished Master's Thesis, San Diego State University, San Diego: California.

Edwards, L. L. (1980). Curriculum modification as a strategy for helping regular classroom behavior-disordered students. Focus on Exceptional Children, 12(8), 1-11.

Evans, S. (1981). Perceptions of classroom teachers, principals, and resource room teachers of the actual roles of the resource teacher. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 14(10), 600-603.

Friend, M. & Bauwens, J. (1988). Managing resistance: An essential consulting skill for learning disabilities teachers. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21(9), 556-561.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C. L. & Allinder, R. M. (1991). The contribution of skills analysis to curroculum-based measurement in spelling. Exceptional Children, 57(5), 443-452.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C. L. & Whinnery, K. (1991). Effects of goal line feedback on level, slope, and stability of performance within curriculum-based measurement. Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 6, 66-74.

Germann, G. & Tindal, G. (1985). An application of curriculum-based assessment: the use of direct and repeated measurement. Exceptional Children, 52(3), 244-265.

Gickling E. E. & Thompson, V. P. (1985). A personal view of curriculum-based measurement. Exceptional Children, 52(3), 205-218.

Goor, M. & Polhill, F. (1991, April). New help for the middle school student with learning disabilities. Paper presented at the 69th Annual International Conference of the Council for Exceptional Children, Atlanta. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 334 775)

Guthrie, L. F. (1989, May). What schools can do for students at risk. Paper presented at Arizona School Administrator's Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323 276)

Hagerty, G. J. & Abramson, M. (1987). Impediments to implementing national policy change for mildly handicapped students. Exceptional Children, 53(4), 315-323.

Hayes, M. V. (1983). A survey of teacher attitudes towards in-class versus pull-out compensatory reading programs. Master's thesis, Kean College, New Jersey. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 228 618)

Heron, T. & Harris, K. C. (1987). Educational Consultant: Helping Professionals, Parents, and Mainstreamed Students (2nd ed.). Austin: Pro-Ed.

Hershfield, M. (1991). Improving reading achievement of chapter 1 pull-out students through self-esteem building classes involving buddy groups and teacher participation. Master's Thesis, Nova University, Ft. Lauderdale. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 337 760)

Huefner, D. S. (1988). The consulting teacher model: Risks and opportunities. Exceptional Children, 54(5), 403-414.

Idol, L. (1988). A rationale and guidelines for establishing special education consultation programs. Remedial and Special Education, 9(6), 48-58.

Idol, L. (1989). The resource/consulting teacher: An integrated model of service delivery. Remedial and Special Education, 10(6), 38-48.

Idol-Maestas, L. (1983). Special educator's consultation handbook. Austin: Pro-Ed.

Idol-Maestas, L., Paolucci-Whitcomb, P., & Nevin, A. (1986). Collaborative consultation. Austin: Pro-Ed.

Jenkins, J. R. & Heinen, A. (1989). Student's preferences for service delivery: Pull-out, in-class, or integrated models. Exceptional Children, 55(6), 516-523.

Keller, C. E. & Hallahan, D. P. (1987). Learning disabilities: Issues and instruction interventions. What research says to the teacher. (Report No. ISBN-0-8106-1076-0). Washington: National Education Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 302)

Madden, N. A. & Slavin, R. E. (1987, April). Effective pull-out programs for students at risk. (Report No. OERI-G-86-0006). Baltimore: Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 921)

Marston, D. (1988). The effectiveness of special education: A time series analysis of reading performance in regular and special education settings. The Journal of Special Education, 21(4), 13-26.

Marston, D. & Magnusson, D. (1985). Implementing curriculum-based measurement in special and regular education settings. Exceptional Children, 52(3), 266-276.

Mazzola, K. (1989). How effective is the basic skills pull-out program? Master's thesis, Kean College, New Jersey. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 576)

McLeod, T. M. & Armstrong, S. W. (1982). Learning disabilities in mathematics - skill deficits and remedial approaches at the intermediate and secondary level. Learning Disability Quarterly, 5, 305-311.

Miller, T. L. & Sabatino, D. A. (1978). An evaluation of the teacher consultation model as an approach to mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 45(2), 86-91.

Mirkin, P., Marston, D., & Deno, S. (1982). Direct and repeated measurement of academic skills: An alternative to traditional screening, referral, and identification of learning disabled students. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities. (ERIC Document Service Reproduction No. ED 224 191)

O'Neil, J. (1988). How special should special education curriculum be? Experts debate merits of academics life skills. Curriculum Update: Developing Leadership for Quality in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 302 026)

Plisko, V. W. & Stern, J. D. (Eds.). (1985). The condition of education. A statistical report. (Report No. NCES-85-402). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. (ERIC Document Service Reproduction No. ED 258 365)

Price, M., Kane, J., Bowman, F., & Ness, J. (1982). Guide to mainstreaming planning committees. Washington, DC: Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 416)

Ramey, M. (1990). Compensatory education sustained gains from spring 1988 to spring 1990. Report No. 91-1). Seattle: Department of Education. (ERIC Document Service Reproduction No. ED 330 764)

Reisberg, L. & Wolf, R. (1988). Instructional strategies for special education. Remedial and Special Education, 9(6), 29-40.

Reynolds, M. C., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 53(5), 391-398.

Riegel, R. H. (1988). A guide to consultation. Novi, Michigan: RHR Consultation Services.

Roemer, M., Schultz, L. M., & Durst, R. K. (1991). Portfolios and the process of change. College Composition and Communication, 42(42), 455-469.

Rosenfield, S. A. (1987). Instructional consultation. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rothstein, L. F. (1990). Special education law. New York: Longman.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (1987). The national education reports and special education: Implications for students. Exceptional Children, 53(4), 300-306.

Schulte, A. C., Osborne, S.S., & McKinney, J. D. (1990). Academic outcomes for students with learning disabilities in consultation and resource programs. Exceptional Children, 57(2), 162-172.

Semmel, M. I., Abernathy, T. V., Butera, G., & Lesar, S. (1991). Teacher perceptions of the regular education initiative. Exceptional Children, 58(1), 9-23.

Stainbeck, W. & Stainbeck, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51(2), 102-111.

Tayler, B. (1985). Let's pull out of the pullout programs. Principal, 42(9), 52-55.

Vasa, S. F., Steckelberg, A. L., & Ronning, L. U. (1982, April). The special education resource teacher as a consultant: Fact or fantasy. Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, Houston. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 918)

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1986). Rethinking special education. Educational Leadership, 44(1), 26-31.

Will, M. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52(3), 411-415.

Wesson, C. L. & Deno, S. L. (1989). An analysis of long-term instructional plans in reading for elementary resource room students. Remedial and Special Education, 10(1), 21-28.

Yau, M. (1988). Alternative service delivery models for learning disabilities students. (Report No. ISBN-0-88881-199-3). Toronto: Toronto Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 309 601)

Zvolensky, C. & Speake, C. (1988, February). Mainstreaming the resource specialist. Washington, DC: National Rural Special Education Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299 731)

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

To: Classroom teachers
From: ESE staff
Re: Program evaluation

You have had an opportunity to interact with the special education teachers on your staff this year. To help us monitor and improve services, would you please take a few minutes to respond to the statements and questions listed below?

UN = Unsatisfactory AV = Average E = Excellent

	UN	AV	E
1. Have you had adequate support to enable you to maximize the education of your ESE student(s)?	1	2	3
2. Have you found the ESE staff receptive to your concerns?	1	2	3
3. Has communication with the ESE staff been satisfactory?	1	2	3
4. Have you learned any new procedures from the ESE staff?	1	2	3
5. Do you feel ESE course work compliments the school's curriculum?	1	2	3
6. Have you been satisfied with the ESE services provided this year? Why or why not?	1	2	3

7. What improvements need to be made to provide better special education service to you and your students?_____

_____

_____

Please return to _____ by _____ .

With which ESE program have you had the most contact?

Thank you for your time and effort.

APPENDIX B

RESOURCE/CONSULTATION LOG

RESOURCE/CONSULTATION LOG

CONSULTANT_____ _____

Teacher	Date/Time	Student	Outcome &Comments	Evaluate on (date)

APPENDIX C

STUDENT PROGRESS FORM

STUDENT PROGRESS FORM

Name _____ Grade _____
Date _____ Report prepared by____ _____

IEP Long Range Goals:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Curriculum-Based Objectives:

	Entry Level	Current Level
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		